IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 10355 OF 2004

Vaman Bal Patil (Rane) &
Jagannath Vaman Patil (Rane)
both deceased, through their legal heirs:
Rajendra Jagannath Patil (Rane) and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10356 OF 2004

Kanu Gopal Rane,
since deceased, through legal heirs
Bhagirathibai Kanu Rane & Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10379 OF 2004

Pandu Gowru Thakare .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10380 OF 2004

Sitaram Govind Rane,
since deceased, through his legal heirs
Ramchandra Sitaram Rane & Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10404 OF 2004

Sitaram Govind Rane,
since deceased, through his legal heirs
Ramchandra Sitaram Rane & Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10432 OF 2004

Sakhubai Vinayak Rane (Patil) & Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10433 OF 2004

Krushanarao Balasaheb Deshmukh .....Petitioner
Versus
State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10436 OF 2004

Shankar Tukuram Rane (Patil),
since deceased, through his legal heir
Anant Vinayak Rane (Patil) .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10437 OF 2004

Sakhubai Vinayak Rane (Patil) & Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10582 OF 2004

Sharad Vinayak Deshmukh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...
Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10583 OF 2004

Anil Vinayak Deshmukh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10586 OF 2004

Anil Vinayak Deshmukh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10587 OF 2004

Anil Vinayak Deshmukh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10588 OF 2004

Anil Vinayak Deshmukh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10589 OF 2004

Anil Vinayak Deshmukh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10590 OF 2004

Anil Vinayak Deshmukh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10591 OF 2004

Anil Vinayak Deshmukh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 10592 OF 2004

Anil Vinayak Deshmukh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

IN ALL PETITIONS:

Mr. R.D. Soni instructed by M/s. Ram & Co. for the Petitioners

Mr. P.M. Patil, Assistant Government Pleader, for the State.

CORAM: **DALVEER BHANDARI, C.J., &**
S.A. BOBDE, J.
DATE: JANUARY 13, 2005.

P.C.

1. All these petitions are being disposed of by this common order.

2. Rule. Mr. P.M. Patil, learned Assistant Government Pleader, waives service of Rule on behalf of the State. By consent, Rule is made returnable forthwith and taken up for hearing.

3. By these petitions, the petitioners are seeking a very limited relief whereby the petitioners' applications, which are pending before the second respondent – Collector, Raigad - under Section 28-A of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 ("the Act", for short), may be decided expeditiously. It appears that pertaining to the same notification,

which covers the lands involved in these petitions, on 6th December, 2000, the Reference Court has granted enhanced compensation. Based on the same, applications were filed under Section 28-A of the Act in February, 2001, which are within the prescribed period of ninety days.

4. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, we direct respondent No.2 – Collector, Raigad – to decide the said applications for enhancement of compensation under Section 28-A of the Act as expeditiously as possible, preferably within three months from the date of receipt of this order. While doing so, the second respondent shall take into account the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of **Union of India and Ors. v. Mangatu Ram**, reported in AIR 1997 SC 2704, which is annexed as Exhibit 'B' to the petitions.

5. No further directions are necessary. Rule is made absolute in the above terms. The Writ Petitions are, accordingly, disposed of.

CHIEF JUSTICE

S.A. BOBDE, J.